

[10191/1775]

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 15-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over United States Patent number 5,841,366 to Yamamoto et al. ("the Yamamoto reference") in view of United States Patent number 5,648,905 to Izumi et al. ("the Izumi reference").

The Office Action asserts "that projecting and interpolation (or extrapolation) are different concepts with different processing procedures from both the mathematic and computer graphics point of view." (Office Action, pg. 6, ll. 1-2). "It has been well known in mathematic and in the arts on computer graphics, projecting a curve onto another position (or plane) means to translate the curve to a plane of different coordinate system..." (Office Action, pg. 5, ll. 8-10). Applicants respectfully submit that usage of the term "projecting" in the specification is different than the usage ascribed by the Office Action. However, in order to expedite prosecution of the claims, the word "projecting" has been removed from the claims and replaced with "extrapolating."

The Yamamoto reference and the Izumi reference do not disclose, teach or suggest "extrapolating the course path of the at least one second vehicle traveling ahead in direction of a position of the first vehicle," as recited in the amended claims. Instead, the Izumi reference estimates the future course path of the first vehicle as a simple curve between the current positions of the two vehicles without regard to the actual course path of the second vehicle. (Izumi, col. 14, l. 28 – col. 15, l. 29). This simple curve between the current positions of the vehicles is not an extrapolation of the course path of the second vehicle in a direction of the first vehicle as recited in the Applicants' claims.

Since the Yamamoto reference and the Izumi reference fail to disclose, teach or suggest each and every feature of claims 15-30, the Yamamoto reference and the Izumi reference fail to render claims 15-30 obvious under 35 U.S.C. §103(a). It is therefore respectfully requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

[10191/1775]

Conclusion

In light of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all of the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Date: December 29, 2003

By: 

Richard L. Mayer
Reg. No. 22,490
(212) 425-7200

CUSTOMER NO. 26646

R. NO.
36,197)